

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is thanked for courtesies extended during an interview held at the PTO on December 3, 2003. Based on the Examiner's suggestions, an additional set of claims, i.e., 40-47 has been added in order to advance prosecution on the merits to a speedy conclusion. The Examiner is respectfully requested to provide detailed feedback regarding the patentability of all claims.

In particular, and in light of the Interview discussion concerning the Lys teaching, the Examiner is requested to identify a teaching or suggestion in Lys of the claimed "connectors adapted to provide power to at least two fluorescent light sources." As pointed out to the Examiner during the Interview, the Examiner-identified portions of Lys (i.e., Col. 42, lines 19-21 and claims 21 and 22) are not enabled and not anticipatory, respectively. Extensive arguments were presented to the Examiner during the course of the interview by the present inventor detailing the lack of enablement of the Lys reference with respect to the column 42 recitation and the plain meaning of claims 21 and 22, many of the arguments are presented herein below. The Examiner is respectfully requested to specifically identify a teaching or suggestion in Lys of the present claimed invention, specifically "connectors adapted to provide power to fluorescent light sources".

Claims 1-47 are pending. Claims 1, 2, and 15-18 have been amended to correct claim terminology even though it is believed that the claims, as written, are understandable to a person of ordinary skill in the art. As described above, claims 40-47 have been newly added in accordance with the Examiner's kind suggestions received during the aforementioned interview. Claims 40-47 are neither taught nor suggested by Lys. In particular, Lys fails to teach or suggest a controller circuit having two or more low power devices and at least two high power devices controlled by one or more of the low power devices, and wherein the high power devices are adapted to respond to a control signal from a low power device and provide power to a connected light source connector as claimed in claim 40.

The drawing objection under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) is believed overcome in view of the foregoing Amendment to Figure 1 respective to the Examiner's objection.

The rejection of claims 15-18, and 20-27 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph is believed overcome in view of the above amendment to claim 15. However, the rejection is

also traversed as it is believed that a person of ordinary skill in the art would understand a fluorescent lamp sufficient to make and/or use the invention based on the description in the specification. See, for example, page 5 third full paragraph of the present specification: "A light source can be any light emitting device, such as compact fluorescent, self ballasted fluorescent . . ." Based on the above, the rejection of claims 15-18, and 20-27 should be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 1-5, 8-18, 21-27, 32, 33, 35, 36, and 39 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lys et al. (U.S. Patent 6,528,954) is hereby traversed. A rejection based on 35 U.S.C. §102 requires every element of the claim to be included in the reference, either directly or inherently. The Examiner has failed to identify all elements of claims 1, 15, and 32 as anticipated by Lys.

The Examiner asserts that Lys "clearly teaches that the fluorescence light could be used as the light source (See Col. 42, lines 19-21 and Claims 21 and 22 of Lys)" page 3 of the present Official Action. Although Lys states "that other systems . . . could also be used" (Col. 42, lines 19-21), Lys fails to enable a person of ordinary skill in the art to make and/or use the "other systems" in the Lys invention. Lys teaches the control of low power LED systems for multicolored display, but fails to teach how to use higher power fluorescent, halogen, and incandescent light sources with the Lys system.

Further, it appears that the Lys system is directed to replacing the higher power light sources with low power LED systems instead of controlling the high power light sources. For example, at column 30, lines 26-53, the Lys system is described as follows (emphasis added):

One of the advantages of the array 37 is that it can be used to construct an LED-based light that overcomes the problem of the need for different fixtures for different lighting applications. In particular, in an embodiment of the invention illustrated in FIG. 20, an array of LEDs 644, which can be the circular array 37 depicted in FIG. 8 or another array, **may be disposed on a platform 642 that is constructed to plug into a fixture, such as an MR-16 fixture for a conventional halogen lamp.** In other embodiments of the invention, **the platform 642 may be shaped to plug, screw or otherwise connect into a power source with the same configuration as a conventional light**

bulb, halogen bulb, or other illumination source. In the embodiment of FIG. 20, a pair of connectors, 646 connect to a power source, such as an electrical wire, in the same manner as connectors for a conventional halogen bulb in an MR-16 fixture.

In an embodiment of the invention depicted in FIG. 21, **the platform 642 bearing the LED array 644 can be plugged into a conventional halogen fixture.** Thus, without changing wiring or fixtures, a user can have LED based lights by simply inserting the modular platform 642. **The user can return to conventional lights by removing the modular platform 642 and installing a conventional halogen bulb or other illumination source.** Thus, the user can use the same fixtures and wiring for a wide variety of lighting applications, including the LED system 120, in the various embodiments disclosed herein.

Thus, Lys is directed at replacing a conventional light bulb, halogen bulb, or other illumination source with an LED-based system and not with a light controller as claimed in claim 1. Further, evidence may be found in claims 21 and 22 relied on by the Examiner, wherein Lys claims: "housing means is configured to fit at least one of a halogen, incandescent and fluorescent light fixture" and "housing means is further configured to resemble at least one of a halogen, incandescent and fluorescent light bulb." Thus, the invention of Lys is meant to replace and appear similar to a halogen, incandescent, and fluorescent light fixture.

Further still, Figures 6-12 and the accompanying specification description of Lys describe the electrical circuit design for the Lys system as providing power to an LED-based system. There is no discussion of the necessary modifications of the Lys system in order to provide power to a high power light source, e.g., a fluorescent light source. That is, as described above, Lys fails to enable anything but an LED-based system.

For any of the above reasons, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from Lys and the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn. Claims 2-5, and 8-14 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1, include further important limitations, and are patentable over Lys for at least the reasons advanced above with respect to claim 1 and the rejection should be

withdrawn.

Claim 15 is patentably distinguishable from Lys for at least reasons similar to those advanced above with respect to claim 1 and the rejection should be withdrawn. Claims 16-18, and 21-27 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 15, include further important limitations, and are patentable over Lys for at least the reasons advanced above with respect to claim 15 and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 32 is patentably distinguishable from Lys for at least reasons similar to those advanced above with respect to claim 1 and the rejection should be withdrawn. Claims 33, 35, 36, and 39 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 32, include further important limitations, and are patentable over Lys for at least the reasons advanced above with respect to claim 32 and the rejection should be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 7, 20, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lys in view of Nishida (U.S. Patent 6,208,319) is hereby traversed. Claims 7, 20, and 34 depend from claims 1, 15, and 32, respectively, and are patentable over Lys for at least the reasons presented above with respect to claims 1, 15, and 32, respectively. The rejection of claims 7, 20, and 34 should be withdrawn.


All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application should be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is hereby requested to contact the undersigned attorney, if necessary to facilitate advancement of the application.

To the extent necessary, please charge any shortage in fee due in connection with this filing to Deposit Account No. 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN GILMAN & BERNER, LLP


Randy A. Noranbrock
Registration No. 42,940

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111 BJH/RAN/iyr
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: December 9, 2003